

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
ALBANY DIVISION**

EDWARD TYRONE RIDLEY,	:	
	:	
Petitioner,	:	
	:	
v.	:	CASE NO.: 1:14-CV-34 (WLS)
	:	
Warden STANLEY WILLIAMS,	:	
	:	
Respondent.	:	
	:	

**ORDER**

Before the Court is a Recommendation from United States Magistrate Judge Thomas Q. Langstaff in this habeas corpus case brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. (Doc. 68.) The Recommendation was filed on June 13, 2014. (*Id.*) Therein, Judge Langstaff recommends that the Court deny Petitioner's requests for injunctive relief (Docs. 36, 48, 53, 54, 58, 64, 65), and deny Petitioner's request for emergency transfer, reduction of sentence or release (Docs. 37, 38, 42, 43, 45, 56). Petitioner was provided with fourteen days to file an objection. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72. Petitioner filed objections on June 25, 2014, and July 3, 2014. (Docs. 78 & 92.) Because the objection period expired on June 27, 2014, Petitioner's June 25 objection is timely but Petitioner's July 3 objection is not.<sup>1</sup>

Petitioner's June 25 objection does not address any of Judge Langstaff's recommendations, but instead generally "object[s] to denying all [his] motions in [this Court's] order especially the extradition challenge that constitute[s] kidnapping by the state of Georgia [and] advise[s] this Court that [he] never filed a state habeas action[;] this case was originally filed in [the Northern District of Florida and that court] transferred this case to [Georgia]."  
(*See Doc. 78.*) Because the referenced objection is not responsive to any portion of Judge Langstaff's Recommendation, Petitioner's June 25 objection is **OVERRULED**. Petitioner's July 3 objection is **OVERRULED** as untimely.

---

<sup>1</sup> Even if the Court were to consider Petitioner's July 3 objection, that objection would nonetheless be overruled because it is not responsive to Judge Langstaff's Recommendation. (*See Doc. 92.*)

Upon full review and consideration of the record, the Court finds that Judge Langstaff's Recommendation (Doc. 68) should be, and hereby is, **ACCEPTED**, **ADOPTED** and made the Order of this Court for reason of the findings made and reasons stated therein, together with the reasons stated and conclusions reached herein. Accordingly, Petitioner's motions seeking various forms of injunctive relief (Docs. 36, 48, 53, 54, 58, 64, 65) and motions seeking emergency transfer, reduction of sentence, or release (Docs. 37, 38, 42, 43, 45, 56) are **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED**, this 15<sup>th</sup> day of July 2014.

/s/ W. Louis Sands

**W. LOUIS SANDS, JUDGE**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**